

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****United States Patent and Trademark Office**Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/341,641 05/09/99 SCHMIDT

Q 020600-280

551839 HM12/0801  
BURNS DOANE SWECKER & MATHIS L L P  
POST OFFICE BOX 1404  
ALEXANDRIA VA 22313-1404

**EXAMINER**

CHAKRABARTI, A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1655

DATE MAILED:

08/01/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

<b>Advisory Action</b>	Application No. <b>09/341,641</b>	Applicant(s) <b>Schmidt et al.</b>
	Examiner <b>Arun Chakrabarti</b>	Art Unit <b>1655</b>

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**THE REPLY FILED Jul 23, 2001 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.**

Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid the abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**THE PERIOD FOR REPLY [check only a) or b)]**

a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b)  In view of the early submission of the proposed reply (within two months as set forth in MPEP § 706.07 (f)), the period for reply expires on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, OR continues to run from the mailing date of the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1.  A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_ . Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.

2.  The proposed amendment(s) will be entered upon the timely submission of a Notice of Appeal and Appeal Brief with requisite fees.

3.  The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:

(a)  they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See NOTE below);

(b)  they raise the issue of new matter. (See NOTE below);

(c)  they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

(d)  they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

4.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

5.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claim(s).

6.  The a)  affidavit, b)  exhibit, or c)  request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
All pending claims could have been rejected on the same grounds and prior art of record (See attached sheet)  
\_\_\_\_\_

7.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

8.  For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claim(s) is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_  
Claim(s) rejected: 21-39 and 41-43  
\_\_\_\_\_

9.  The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ a)  has b)  has not been approved by the Examiner.

10.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.

11.  Other:  
\_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit:

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Applicant also argues that there is no motivation to combine the Bensimon reference with Southern et al reference. This argument is not persuasive, especially in the presence of express motivation provided by Bensimon as Bensimon states, "This method enables a heterogeneous population of DNA molecules (already anchored to the movable support) to be sequenced or tested in series (Column 7, lines 27-29)".

Applicant argues that Bensimon reference teaches the use of sequencing DNA in series by coupling them one after another and therefore the heterogeneous population of single stranded DNA is not immobilized in the same reaction zone. Applicant argues that because Bensimon has a preferred embodiment of sequencing DNA in series by coupling them one after another, Bensimon is limited to the preferred embodiment. As MPEP 2123 states "Disclosed examples and preferred embodiments do not constitute a teaching away from a broader disclosure or nonpreferred embodiments. *In re Susi*, 169 USPQ 423 (CCPA 1971)." MPEP 2123 also states "A reference may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill the art, including nonpreferred embodiments. *Merck & Co. v. Biocraft Laboratories* , 10 USPQ2d 1843 (Fed. Cir. 1989)." It is clear that simply because Bensimon has

Art Unit:

a preferred embodiment of sequencing DNA in series by coupling them one after another, this embodiment does not prevent the reference from suggesting broader embodiments in the disclosure and that this does not constitute a teaching away. For example, see Figure 1 and Column 7, line 62 to column 8, line 17, which clearly shows at least two strands of single stranded DNA immobilized in the same reaction zone.



JEFFREY FREDMAN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER